

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**


Aunhk Ra Aunhkhotep,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
)	No. 4: 23 CV 540 RWS
)	
Joseph Kopfensteiner, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff’s motion to schedule an in-person hearing so that the Court can “supervise” the copying of cellphone video footage. [34]. Plaintiff states that he believes the footage could be destroyed or edited if shown to defense counsel outside the courtroom. He also claims not to know how to produce the footage. The motion is denied, as the Court does not supervise the production of discovery materials. Plaintiff is not obligated to show the footage to defense counsel in his office and may pick another location of his choosing if he so wishes, but the Court has no reason to believe that counsel will not adhere to his ethical obligations in every respect. As for producing the cellphone footage, the Court cannot advise plaintiff but he should consult defense for an acceptable method of production, which may include simply providing the footage by email, a process which should be familiar to plaintiff.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to schedule an in-person hearing [34] is denied.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rodney W. Sippe", written over a horizontal line.

RODNEY W. SIPPEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 22nd day of December, 2023.